DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 106 373 TM 004 562

AUTHOR Frey, Sherman
TITLE An Analysis of Self Study and Visiting Committee Aspects of Selected NCA Secondary School Evaluations to Determine Least and Most Effective Procedures.
NOTE 61p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; *Committees; *Evaluation; *Evaluation Methods; Faculty; Secondary Education; *Selection; *Surveys; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS North Central Association of Colleges and Schools

ABSTRACT

The general purpose of this study was to survey and analyze the self study and visiting committee aspects of selected North Central Association (NCA) secondary school evaluations to determine their effectiveness in terms of evaluation of the procedure used in selecting and comprising these committees and their activities. The study is presented in three parts and the results are reported in tabular and narrative form. Part I is concerned with the self study aspect of the evaluative procedure. It reports effectiveness in terms of evaluation of the selection, composition, and activities of the steering and work committees in NCA evaluations. The tables and discussion in this part, as in remaining parts, are on the total response of administrators and teachers from all responding schools first, followed by a breakdown of response by size of school, and finally by the separate responses of administrators and teachers. Part II is concerned with the visiting committee aspect of NCA evaluation. Part III is a summary of the results. (Author/BJG)

ED106373

AN ANALYSIS OF SELF STUDY AND VISITING COMMITTEE ASPECTS OF SELECTED NCA SECONDARY SCHOOL EVALUATIONS TO DETERMINE LEAST AND MOST EFFECTIVE PROCEDURES.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Dr. Sherman Frey
Professor of Education
Northern Illinois University
District Director
NCA Districts 6 & 7

TM 004 562

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction and Purpose of Study	1
Methodology	2
Part I - The Self Study	4
Selection and Composition of the Steering Committee	4
Selection and Composition of the Work Committees	13
Activities of the Self Study Committees	23
Part II - The Visitation	32
Selection and Composition of the Visiting Committee	32
Activities of the Visiting Committee	41
Part III - Summary of Results	51
Appendix - Survey Instrument	55

An Analysis of Self Study and Visiting Committee Aspects of Selected NCA Secondary School Evaluations to determine Least and Most Effective Procedures.

Introduction and Purpose of Study

In recent years the methodology of evaluation has received considerable attention. This has been due primarily to the upsurge of accountability in the educational enterprise as well as to the sincere desire on the part of educators to improve the quality of education for youth. One of the leaders in the field has been the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA) through its Commission on Schools. In 1965 it initiated a program of evaluation for its member schools in the nineteen states that it serves. The program caught the attention of the education profession and its general format for evaluation has been adopted by many state agencies who are mandated to evaluate schools for accreditation and recognition purposes.

The thrust of the NCA evaluation program is that it provides its member schools with a viable technique for the assessment and improvement of their instructional programs. However, the use that individual schools make of it is ultimately dependent upon their particular desire to enhance and improve their instructional programs for students. To this end the internal processes of the evaluation become paramount. They combine to make an evaluation useful or not depending upon the choices made in establishing and activating the program of evaluation.

The present state of knowledge with regard to the internal procedures of evaluation is limited. Recommendations are made to schools about to undergo evaluation on such things as setting up self study committees and selecting visiting committee members but little has been done in any systematic way to determine if these procedures are effective in bringing about a good

evaluation or, in fact, if there are better ways for doing so. Therefore, the general purpose of this study was to survey and analyze the self study and visiting committee aspects of selected NCA secondary school evaluations to determine their effectiveness in terms of evaluation of the procedures used in selecting and comprizing these committees and their activities. More specifically:

1. What procedures in the selection and composition of the steering committee in the self study aspect of an NCA evaluation are least and most effective in terms of evaluation and to what extent are they used?
2. What procedures in the selection and composition of the work committees in the self study aspect of an NCA evaluation are least and most effective in terms of evaluation and to what extent are they used.
3. What activities of the self study committees in an NCA evaluation are least and most effective in terms of evaluation and to what extent are they used.
4. What procedures in the selection and composition of the visiting committee in an NCA evaluation are least and most effective in terms of evaluation and to what extent are they used?
5. What activities of the visiting committee in an NCA evaluation are least and most effective in terms of evaluation and to what extent are they used?

Methodology

To carry out the purpose of this study the administrators and faculties (i.e. steering committee members) of those Illinois schools in NCA Districts 6 and 7 who had undergone an NCA evaluation within the last three years were surveyed. These individuals, having been intimately involved with the internal processes of evaluation and having the advantage of perspective, would be the

most valid and reliable sources of information available with regard to the effectiveness of those processes. To this end an instrument was constructed (see appendix) and mailed to twenty-four schools ranging in size from 124 to 3,159 pupils. A total of eighty three questionnaires from eighteen schools were returned, twenty-one from administrators and sixty-two from the steering committee members in these schools. The breakdown of returns by size of school was: eight returns (below 200), twenty-three returns (300-600), twenty-one returns (750-1,000), eighteen returns (1,500 to 2,000), and thirteen returns (over 2,000). Additionally, twelve administrators were interviewed in nine schools which had recently undergone evaluation to secure additional information concerning the effectiveness of procedures in NCA evaluations.

The results of this study are reported in tabular and narrative form in three parts. Part I is concerned with the self study aspect of the evaluative procedure. It reports effectiveness in terms of evaluation of the selection, composition, and activities of the steering and work committees in NCA evaluations. The tables and discussion in this part, as in all remaining parts, are on the total response of administrators and teachers from all responding schools first, followed by a breakdown of response by size of school, and finally by the separate responses of administrators and teachers. Part II is concerned with the visiting committee aspect of NCA evaluation. It reports effectiveness in terms of evaluation of the selection, composition, and activities of visiting committees. The tables and discussion in Part II are organized and presented in the same manner as in Part I. Part III is a summary of the results.

PART I

The Self Study

The Evaluation Guide for Secondary Schools[1] says "the self study is that part of the evaluation which is carried on by the faculty. It begins with the decision to carry on the evaluation and corcludes when the faculty has agreed upon or revised the findings of the various work committees." Obviously, in terms of the total evaluation the self study is pre-eminent because it is in the initiatory position and because it provides the basis for the work of the visiting committee.

Selection and Composition of the Steering Committee

One of the first things to be done after the decision has been made to undergo an evaluation is the selection of the steering committee. It is the responsibility of this committee to ensure that the purpose of the evaluation is carried out. To this end it usually selects, guides, and coordinates the work committees and selects the visiting committee. Its chairperson becomes a key person in the organization and coordination of the total evaluation. Therefore, the selection and composition of the steering committee and its chairperson is critical to the total evaluation.

Table I shows what the responding administrators and teachers thought of the effectiveness of procedures used in the selection and composition of the steering committee. The most frequently used procedure in the selection of the steering committee was selection by the administration. This procedure was also deemed to be the most effective in terms of

[1] Evaluation Guide for Secondary Schools, prepared by the Committee Accreditation Procedures of the Commission on Secondary Schools, North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, p. 9.

TABLE I
(N=83)

The Effectiveness in Terms of Evaluation of the Selection and Composition of the Steering Committee in NCA Evaluations as reported by Administrators and Teachers

Steering Committee Selection & Composition	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation								Use of Procedure			
	Least		Some		Moderate		Most		Yes		No	
Selection	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Selected by faculty	9	11	14	17	23	28	8	10	14	17	63	76
2. Selected from volunteers from faculty	10	12	17	21	13	16	17	21	23	28	54	65
3. Selected by administration	4	5	5	6	26	31	34	41	62	75	15	18
4. Selected from a pool of elected faculty by administration	11	13	8	10	22	27	5	6	4	5	72	87
5. Chairperson selected by faculty	20	24	9	11	11	13	6	7	4	5	71	86
6. Chairperson selected by steering committee	8	10	8	10	17	21	18	22	15	19	61	74
7. Chairperson selected by administrator	5	6	5	6	27	33	29	35	56	68	21	25
8. Chairperson an administrator	7	8	5	6	12	15	23	28	34	41	41	49
Composition												
9. Departments heads only	15	18	10	12	12	15	10	12	16	19	58	70
10. Representation from each department or subject area	2	2	12	15	16	19	22	27	21	25	55	66
11. Less than one from each department or subject area	12	15	13	16	24	29	13	16	43	52	32	39
12. Experienced faculty only	9	11	4	5	18	22	37	45	51	61	24	29

TABLE II
(N=8)

The Effectiveness in Terms of Evaluation of the Selection and Composition of the Steering Committee in NCA Evaluation as reported by Administrators and Teachers in Schools below 200 enrollment.

Steering Committee Selection & Composition	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation								Use of Procedure			
	Least		Some		Moderate		Most		Yes		No	
Selection	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Selected by faculty	4	50	1	13	2	25	0	0	2	25	6	75
2. Selected from volunteers from faculty	1	13	2	25	4	50	0	0	1	13	7	88
3. Selected by administration	0	0	0	0	3	38	5	63	8	100	0	0
4. Selected from a pool of elected faculty by administration	3	38	2	25	1	13	0	0	0	0	8	100
5. Chairperson selected by faculty	5	63	0	0	2	25	0	0	0	0	8	100
6. Chairperson selected by steering committee	2	25	0	0	2	25	3	38	1	13	7	88
7. Chairperson selected by administrator	0	0	0	0	3	38	5	63	8	100	0	0
8. Chairperson an administrator	2	25	2	25	2	25	1	13	1	13	7	88
Composition												
9. Departments heads only	3	38	2	25	0	0	2	25	1	13	7	88
10. Representation from each department or subject area	0	0	4	50	2	25	1	13	2	25	6	75
11. Less than one from each department or subject area	1	13	3	38	4	50	0	0	3	38	5	63
12. Experienced faculty only	2	25	0	0	2	25	4	50	5	63	3	38

TABLE III
(N=23)

The Effectiveness in Terms of Evaluation of the Selection And Composition of the Steering Committee in NCA Evaluation as reported by Administrators and Teachers in Schools between 300 and 600 enrollment

Steering Committee Selection & Composition	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation								Use of Procedure			
	Least		Some		Moderate		Most		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Selection												
1. Selected by faculty	1	4	1	4	7	30	4	17	6	26	16	70
2. Selected from volunteers from faculty	4	17	3	14	1	4	0		3	14	18	78
3. Selected by administration	1	4	0		6	26	8	35	16	70	5	22
4. Selected for a pool of elected faculty by administration	0		1	4	3	14	1	4	0		21	91
5. Chairperson selected by faculty	0		2	9	2	9	2	9	1	4	19	83
6. Chairperson selected by steering committee	1	4	0		5	22	6	26	10	44	12	52
7. Chairperson selected by administrator	2	9	1	4	4	17	5	22	10	44	10	44
8. Chairperson an administrator	2	9	0		0		2	9	3	14	18	78
Composition												
9. Departments heads only	1	4	1	4	3	14	2	9	4	17	17	74
10. Representation from each department or subject area	0		0		3	14	4	17	6	26	15	65
11. Less than one from each department or subject area	1	4	4	17	8	78	2	9	14	61	7	30
12. Experienced faculty only	0		0		2	9	13	57	13	57	8	78

TABLE IV
(N=21)

The Effectiveness in Terms of Evaluation of the Selection and Composition of the Steering Committee in NCA Evaluations as reported by Administrators and Teachers in Schools between 750 and 1000 enrollment

Steering Committee Selection & Composition	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation								Use of Procedure			
	Least		Some		Moderate		Most		Yes		No	
Selection	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Selected by faculty	2	10	7	33	6	29	0		1	5	18	86
2. Selected from volunteers from faculty	2	10	3	14	5	24	6	29	7	33	12	57
3. Selected by administration	1	5	4	19	6	29	8	38	14	19	4	19
4. Selected from a pool of elected faculty by administration	4	19	2	10	8	38	1	5	0		18	86
5. Chairperson selected by faculty	8	38	3	14	3	14	1	5	1	5	17	81
6. Chairperson selected by steering committee	1	5	5	24	4	19	3	14	0		18	86
7. Chairperson selected by administrator	1	5	3	14	9	43	6	29	15	71	4	19
8. Chairperson an administrator	0		2	10	3	14	10	48	14	19	5	24
Composition												
9. Departments heads only	6	29	3	14	4	19	2	10	6	29	12	57
10. Representation from each department or subject area	1	5	4	19	5	24	5	24	3	14	15	71
11. Less than one from each department or subject area	2	10	5	24	4	19	7	33	15	71	4	19
12. Experienced faculty only	1	5	1	5	9	43	7	33	16	76	2	10

TABLE V
(N=18)

The Effectiveness in Terms of Evaluation of the Selection and Composition of the Steering Committee in NCA Evaluations as reported by Administrators and Teachers in Schools between 1500 and 2000 enrollment

Steering Committee Selection & Composition	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation								Use of Procedure			
	Least		Some		Moderate		Most		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Selection												
1. Selected by faculty	0		3	17	5	28	2	11	4	22	14	78
2. Selected from volunteers from faculty	1	6	5	28	1	6	6	33	7	39	11	61
3. Selected by administration	1	6	0		8	44	7	39	14	78	3	17
4. Selected from a pool of elected faculty by administration	3	17	0		4	22	2	11	2	11	15	83
5. Chairperson selected by faculty	3	17	3	17	1	6	1	6	2	11	16	89
6. Chairperson selected by steering committee	2	11	3	17	1	6	3	17	4	22	14	78
7. Chairperson selected by administrator	1	6	0		5	28	9	50	13	72	5	28
8. Chairperson an administrator	0		0		2	11	9	50	11	61	7	39
Composition												
9. Departments heads only	1	6	3	17	2	11	3	17	4	22	12	67
10. Representation from each department or subject area	0		3	17	1	6	9	50	9	50	8	44
11. Less than one from each department or subject area	5	28	0		3	17	2	11	6	33	9	50
12. Experienced faculty only	1	6	1	6	1	6	11	61	11	61	7	39

TABLE VI
(N=13)

The Effectiveness in Terms of Evaluation of the Selection and Composition of the Steering Committee in NCA Evaluation as reported by Administrators and Teachers in Schools over 2000 enrollment.

Steering Committee Selection & Composition	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation								Use of Procedure			
	Least		Some		Moderate		Most		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Selection												
1. Selected by faculty	2	15	2	15	3	23	2	15	1	8	9	69
2. Selected from Volunteers from faculty	2	15	4	30	2	15	5	39	5	39	6	46
3. Selected by administration	1	8	1	8	3	23	6	46	10	77	3	24
4. Selected from a pool of elected faculty by administration	1	8	3	23	6	46	1	8	2	15	10	77
5. Chairperson selected by faculty	4	31	1	8	3	23	2	15	0	0	11	85
6. Chairperson selected by steering committee	2	15	0	0	5	39	3	23	1	8	10	77
7. Chairperson selected by administrator	1	8	1	8	6	46	4	31	10	77	2	15
8. Chairperson an administrator	3	23	1	8	5	39	1	8	5	39	4	31
Composition												
9. Departments heads only	4	31	1	8	3	23	1	8	1	8	10	77
10. Representation from each department or subject area	1	8	1	8	5	39	3	23	1	8	11	85
11. Less than one from each department or subject area	3	23	1	8	5	39	2	15	5	39	7	54
12. Experienced faculty only	5	39	2	15	4	31	2	15	6	46	4	31

TABLE VII
(N=21)

The Effectiveness in Terms of Evaluation of the Selection and Composition of the Steering Committee in NCA Evaluations as reported by Administrators

Steering Committe Selection & Composition	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation								Use of Procedure			
	Least		Some		Moderate		Most		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Selection												
1. Selected by faculty	3	14	6	29	6	28	2	10	8	38	11	52
2. Selected fro volunteers from faculty	2	10	8	38	4	19	4	19	11	52	9	43
3. Selected by administration	1	5	0		6	29	11	52	17	81	3	14
4. Selected from a pool of elected faculty by administration	7	33	3	14	3	14	2	10	1	5	17	81
5. Chairperson selected by faculty	9	43	2	10	2	10	1	5	3	14	16	76
6. Chairperson selected by steering committee	3	14	3	14	3	14	5	24	4	19	15	71
7. Chairperson selected by administrator	1	5	1	5	3	14	13	62	17	81	4	19
8. Chairperson an administrator	1	5	2	10	2	10	8	38	10	48	10	48
Composition												
9. Departments heads only	5	24	2	10	3	14	4	19	6	29	11	52
10. Representation from each department or subject area	1	5	5	24	5	24	5	24	8	38	10	47
11. Less than one from eache department or subject area	5	24	2	10	5	24	3	14	10	48	9	43
12. Experienced faculty only	3	14	0		5	24	10	48	15	71	4	19

TABLE VIII
(N=62)

The Effectiveness in Terms of Evaluation of the Selection and Composition of The Steering Committee in NCA Evaluations as Reported by Teachers.

Steering Committees Selection & Composition	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation								Use of Procedure			
	Least		Some		Moderate		Most		Yes		No	
Selection	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Selected by faculty	6	10	8	13	17	27	6	10	6	10	52	84
2. Selected from volunteers from faculty	8	13	9	15	9	15	13	21	12	19	45	73
3. Selected by administration	3	5	5	8	20	32	23	37	45	73	12	19
4. Selected from a pool of elected faculty by administration	4	7	5	8	19	31	3	5	3	5	55	89
5. Chairperson selected by faculty	11	18	7	12	9	15	5	8	1	2	55	89
6. Chairperson selected by steering committee	5	8	5	8	14	23	13	21	12	19	46	74
7. Chairperson selected by administrator	4	7	4	7	24	39	16	26	39	63	17	27
8. Chairperson an administrator	6	10	3	5	10	16	15	24	24	39	31	50
Composition												
9. Department Heads only	10	16	8	13	9	15	6	10	10	16	47	76
10. Representation from each department or subject area	1	2	7	11	11	18	17	27	13	21	45	73
11. Less than one from each department or subject area	7	11	11	18	19	31	10	16	33	53	23	37
12. Experienced faculty only	6	10	4	7	13	21	27	44	36	58	20	32

evaluation. The least used procedure was selection from a pool of elected faculty by administration. It was also regarded as least effective, as were the other procedures involving selection by the faculty of the steering committee. Having only experienced faculty on the steering committee was regarded by the greatest number of respondents as being most effective, far outstripping having only department heads as steering committee members. There was also strong indication that it was best to have representation from each department or subject area on the steering committee even though this was not the usual procedure employed.

Response to the selection and composition of the steering committee by size of school as shown in tables II, III, IV, V, and VI indicates a consistency in the pattern of responses with the exception of those in the 300 to 600 size range where the selection of the chairperson by the steering committee was given a slightly higher effectiveness ratio than selection by the administrator. Tables VII and VIII show the administrators and teachers generally agreed on the procedure for selecting and composing the steering committee.

Selection and Composition of the Work Committees

The functions of the work committees in an NCA evaluation are to collect data about existing programs or services, to identify areas of strength and weakness, and to make recommendations for improvement as they see the need. In effect they provide the data, along with their analysis of it, from which the visiting committee makes a substantial portion of their judgment about the programs and the services of the school. The work committee system also provides a vehicle by which the total faculty can be involved in the evaluative process. Therefore, their selection and composition is a vital aspect of the total evaluation if a good self evaluation is to ensue.

The administrators and teachers involved in this study responded as shown on table IX to the effectiveness and use of various procedures in selecting and composing the work committees of an NCA evaluation. Selection by the steering committee was the procedure most utilized. It was also felt to be most effective in terms of evaluation by a plurality of respondents. Having work committees selected by the department chairperson was judged least effective and was least used.

The composition and participation of work committees was fairly consistent with NCA recommendations. Interdepartmental or interdisciplinary membership and total faculty participation on at least one committee, with committee size greater than three, were widely used procedures and were generally regarded as effective. Contrasted to the composition of steering committee, however, the respondents generally felt that service on a work committee should not be limited to experienced faculty. This was not regarded as a popular procedure insofar as utilization and effectiveness are concerned; nor was membership solely from a department or subject area and committee size equal to or less than three.

Response by size of school to the selection and composition of the work committees indicates no large differences from the general pattern except that the use of volunteers on work committees was more frequent and was regarded as more effective than any other in schools with over 2,000 enrollment. Tables X, XI, XII, XIII, and XIV show results by size. Tables XV and XVI show general agreement by administrators and teachers with regard to the selection and composition of work committees for an NCA evaluation with administrators indicating more of an inclination towards volunteer faculty in this respect.

TABLE IX
(N=83)

The Effectiveness in Terms of Evaluation of the Selection and Composition of Work Committees in NCA Evaluations as reported by Administrators and Teachers

Work Committees Selection & Composition	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation				Use of Procedure	
	Least	Some	Moderate	Most	Yes	No
Selection	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %
1. Selected by faculty in each department	4 5	7 8	18 22	16 19	15 18	56 68
2. Volunteers	4 5	9 11	16 19	20 24	28 34	43 52
3. Selected by steering committee	2 2	6 7	26 31	39 47	57 69	20 24
4. Selected by administration	6 7	11 13	23 28	12 15	22 27	50 60
5. Selected by department chairperson	12 15	16 19	11 13	4 5	12 15	61 74
Composition						
6. Experienced faculty only	16 19	11 13	9 11	15 18	16 19	56 68
7. Interdepartmental or interdisciplinary membership	3 4	4 5	27 33	39 47	64 77	10 12
8. Membership solely from department or subject area	18 22	15 18	6 7	10 12	10 12	62 75
9. Total faculty participation on at least one committee	4 5	2 2	17 21	53 64	65 78	14 17
10. Faculty participation on more than two committees	10 12	15 18	26 31	14 17	39 47	28 34
11. Committee size equal to or less than three	17 21	11 13	19 23	13 16	26 31	44 53
12. Committee size greater than three	1 1	5 6	29 35	31 37	54 65	18 22

TABLE X
(N=8)

The Effectiveness in Terms of Evaluation of the Selection and Composition of Work Committees in NCA Evaluations as reported by Administrators and Teachers in Schools below 200 enrollment.

Work Committees Selection & Composition	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation								Use of Procedure			
	Least		Some		Moderate		Most		Yes		No	
Selection	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Selected by faculty in each department	3	38	1	13	2	25	1	13	1	13	6	75
2. Volunteers	0	0	1	13	7	88	0	0	3	38	4	50
3. Selected by steering committee	0	0	2	25	4	50	2	25	7	88	1	13
4. Selected by administration	1	13	2	25	3	38	2	25	5	63	3	38
5. Selected by department chairperson	2	25	3	38	1	13	1	13	1	13	7	88
Composition												
6. Experienced faculty only	4	50	0	0	1	13	2	25	4	50	4	50
7. Interdepartmental or inter-disciplinary membership	1	13	0	0	2	25	5	63	6	75	2	25
8. Membership solely from depart-ment or subject area	3	38	2	25	0	0	2	25	3	38	5	63
9. Total faculty participation on at least one committee	1	13	0	0	4	50	3	38	5	63	3	38
10. Faculty participation on more than two committees	1	13	1	13	5	63	1	13	6	75	2	25
11. Committee size equal to or less than three	3	38	1	13	2	25	2	25	4	50	4	50
12. Committee size greater than three	1	13	1	13	2	25	3	38	5	63	3	38

TABLE XI
(N=23)

The Effectiveness in Terms of Evaluation of the Selection and Composition of Work Committees in NCA Evaluations as reported by Administrators and Teachers in Schools between 300 and 600 enrollment

Work Committees Selection and Composition	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation								Use of Procedure			
	Least		Some		Moderate		Most		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Selection												
1. Selected by faculty in each department	0		0		1	4	4	17	3	14	17	74
2. Volunteers	1	4	0		0		2	9	0		20	87
3. Selected by steering committee	0		0		5	22	11	48	12	52	10	44
4. Selected by administration	1	4	0		2	9	5	22	5	22	15	65
5. Selected by department chairperson	1	4	2	9	1	4	0		0		20	87
Composition												
6. Experienced faculty only	1	4	0		0		5	22	5	22	15	65
7. Interdepartmental of interdisciplinary membership	2	9	0		8	34	7	30	15	65	6	26
8. Membership solely from department of subject area	2	9	2	9	0		1	4	4	17	16	70
9. Total faculty participation on at least one committee	0		1	4	5	22	15	65	19	83	2	9
10. Faculty particiaption on more than two committees	3	14	1	4	6	26	7	30	15	65	5	22
11. Committee size equal to or less than three	1	4	1	4	5	22	2	9	8	35	12	52
12. Committee size greater than three	0		2	9	9	39	5	22	12	52	9	39

TABLE XII
(N=21)

The Effectiveness in Terms of Evaluation of the Selection and Composition of Work Committees in NCA Evaluations as reported by Administrators and Teachers in Schools between 750 and 1000 enrollment

Work Committees Selection and Composition	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation								Use of Procedure			
	Least		Some		Moderate		Most		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Selection												
1. Selected by faculty in each department	1	5	2	10	9	43	5	24	4	19	14	67
2. Volunteers	1	5	3	14	4	19	7	33	9	43	9	43
3. Selected by sterring committee	1	5	1	5	9	43	9	43	14	68	3	14
4. Selected by administration	1	5	5	24	8	38	3	14	4	19	14	67
5. Selected by department chairperson	2	10	6	29	6	29	2	10	8	38	11	52
Composition												
6. Experienced faculty only	3	14	6	29	3	14	4	19	2	10	16	76
7. Interdepartmental or interdisciplinary membership	0		2	10	6	29	11	52	18	86	0	
8. Membership solely from department or subject area	5	24	3	14	3	14	5	24	0		18	86
9. Total faculty participation on at least one committee	2	10	1	5	4	19	12	57	14	67	6	29
10. Faculty participation on more than two committees	3	14	4	19	7	33	3	14	13	62	7	33
11. Committee size equal to or less than three	3	14	5	24	6	29	3	14	8	38	11	52
12. Committee size greater than three	0		1	5	8	38	8	38	16	76	2	10

TABLE XIII
(N=18)

The Effectiveness in Terms of Evaluation of the Selection and Composition of Work Committees in NCA Evaluations as reported by Administrators and Teachers in Schools between 1500 and 2000 enrollment

Work Committees Selection & Composition	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation								Use of Procedure			
	Least		Some		Moderate		Most		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Selection												
1. Selected by faculty in each department	0		3	17	2	11	3	17	5	28	11	61
2. Volunteers	2	11	3	17	4	22	3	17	6	33	9	50
3. Selected by steering committee	0		1	6	4	22	11	61	15	83	2	11
4. Selected by administration	1	6	1	6	7	39	2	11	7	39	9	50
5. Selected by department chairperson	3	17	3	17	2	11	0		1	6	15	83
Composition												
6. Experienced faculty only	2	11	3	17	2	11	4	22	11	61	16	89
7. Interdepartmental or interdisciplinary membership	0		2	11	4	22	11	61	16	89	0	
8. Membership solely from department or subject area	2	11	5	28	2	11	1	6	3	17	13	72
9. Total faculty participation on at least one committee	1	6	0		3	17	13	72	17	94	0	
10. Faculty participation on more than two committees	3	17	5	28	3	17	1	6	5	28	11	61
11. Committee size equal to or less than three	5	28	1	6	4	22	4	22	5	28	9	50
12. Committee size greater than	0		0		7	39	8	44	12	67	2	11

TABLE XIV
(N=13)

The Effectiveness in Terms of Evaluation of the Selection and Composition of Work Committees in NCA Evaluations as reported by Administrators and Teachers in Schools over 2000 enrollment.

Work Committee Selection & Composition	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation								Use of Procedure			
	Least		Some		Moderate		Most		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Selection												
1. Selected by faculty in each department	0	0	1	8	4	31	3	23	2	15	8	62
2. Volunteers	0	0	2	15	1	8	8	62	10	77	1	8
3. Selected by steering committee	1	8	2	15	4	31	6	46	9	69	4	31
4. Selected by adminstration	2	15	3	23	3	23	0	0	1	8	9	69
5. Selected by department chairperson	4	31	2	15	1	8	1	8	2	15	8	62
Composition												
6. Experienced faculty only	6	46	2	15	3	23	0	0	1	8	9	69
7. Interdepartmental or interdisciplinary membership	0	0	0	0	7	54	5	39	9	69	2	15
8. Membership solely from department or subject area	6	46	3	23	1	8	1	8	0	0	10	77
9. Total faculty participation on at least one committee	0	0	0	0	1	8	10	77	10	77	3	23
10. Faculty participation on more than two committees	0	0	4	31	5	39	2	15	6	46	3	23
11. Committee size equal to or less than three	5	39	3	23	2	15	2	15	1	8	8	62
12. Committee size greater than three	0	0	1	8	3	23	7	54	9	69	2	15

TABLE XV
(N=21)

The Effectiveness in Terms of Evaluation of the Selection and Composition of Work Committees in NCA Evaluations as reported by Administrators

Work Committees Selection & Composition	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation								Use of Procedure			
	Least		Some		Moderate		Most		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Selection												
1. Selected by faculty in each department	2	10	1	5	6	29	5	24	8	38	11	52
2. Volunteers	1	5	4	19	7	33	5	24	10	48	9	43
3. Selected by steering committee	1	5	2	10	6	29	11	52	15	71	5	24
4. Selected by administration	1	5	5	24	4	19	3	14	5	24	13	62
5. Selected by department chairperson	5	24	5	24	1	5	3	14	3	14	15	71
Composition												
6. Experienced faculty only	5	24	4	19	2	10	3	14	5	24	13	62
7. Interdepartmental or interdisciplinary membership	2	10	0		8	38	10	48	17	81	3	14
8. Membership solely from department or subject area	6	29	3	14	1	5	3	14	6	29	12	57
9. Total faculty participation on at least one committee	1	5	0		7	33	13	62	18	86	3	14
10. Faculty participation on more than two committees	2	10	4	19	10	48	1	5	11	52	8	38
11. Committee size equal to or less than three	6	29	3	14	5	24	2	10	8	38	9	43
12. Committee size greater than three	0		2	10	9	43	9	43	16	76	3	14

TABLE XVI
(N=62)

The Effectiveness in Terms of Evaluation of the Selection and Composition of Work Committees in NCA Evaluations as Reported By Teachers.

Work Committees Selection and Composition	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation								Use of Procedure			
	Least		Some		Moderate		Most		Yes		No	
Selection	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Selected by faculty in each department	2	3	6	10	12	19	11	18	7	60	45	73
2. Volunteers	3	5	5	8	9	15	15	24	18	29	34	55
3. Selected by steering committee	1	2	4	7	20	32	28	45	42	68	15	24
4. Selected by administration	5	8	6	10	19	31	9	15	17	27	37	60
5. Selected by department chairperson	7	11	11	18	10	16	1	2	9	15	46	74
Composition												
6. Experienced faculty only	11	18	7	11	7	11	12	19	11	18	43	69
7. Interdepartmental or inter-disciplinary membership	1	2	4	7	19	31	29	47	47	76	7	11
8. Membership solely from department or subject area	12	19	12	19	5	8	7	11	4	7	50	81
9. Total faculty participation on at least one committee	3	5	2	3	10	16	40	65	47	76	11	18
10. Faculty participation on more than two committees	8	13	11	18	16	26	13	21	28	45	20	32
11. Committee size equal to or less than three	11	18	8	13	14	23	11	18	18	29	35	57
12. Committee size greater than three	1	2	3	5	20	32	22	36	38	61	15	24

The Activities of the Self Study Committees

The variety of activities engaged in by the self study committees in an NCA evaluation as shown on table XVII revolve primarily around the need to gather, organize and analyze data so that recommendations can be made and so that the visiting committee can have a basis from which they can make their evaluation. It comes as no surprise then that the activities most frequently used, and which were regarded by the largest number as most effective, were gathering and analyzing data, summarizing, and identifying strengths and weaknesses with recommendations for change. Others having frequent use with relatively high effectiveness ratings, were sharing data and seeking feedback within respective departments or subject areas, having individuals responsible for completing certain sections of the Evaluative Criteria, having general discussion within departments or areas on all sections of the Criteria, and modifying the Criteria to fit the needs of the school. While the activities involving the sharing of data with the total faculty were indicated as being engaged in by a majority of the respondents they did not receive the support given the aforementioned activities. The activity of using outside consultants in the self study was the least used and its effectiveness was generally the lowest rated. There was much use of board and community members in the self study but reluctance to support their effectiveness in the evaluative process.

The pattern of responses by size of school as shown in tables XVIII, XIX, XX, XXI and XXII does not vary much from the general pattern as described above. The smaller the school, of course, the more totally involved the faculty was in sharing all the data generated by the various self study committees. Also, administrators saw more of a need for the sharing of data by the total faculty than did teachers. Otherwise, tables XXIII and XIV show similar responses by these two groups.

TABLE XVII
(N=83)

The Effectiveness in Terms of Evaluation of Selected Activities of Self Study Committees in NCA Evaluations as reported by Administrators and Teachers

Activities of Self Study Committees	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation								Use of Procedure			
	Least		Some		Moderate		Most		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Gathering and analyzing data	0	0	4	5	23	28	50	60	75	90	6	7
2. Sharing data in total faculty meetings	2	2	12	15	20	24	32	39	50	60	30	36
3. Sharing data through written reports to total faculty	3	4	10	12	33	40	23	28	49	59	31	37
4. Seeking feedback of total faculty in faculty meetings	2	2	11	13	29	35	24	29	49	59	32	39
5. Sharing data and seeking feedback within respective departments or subject areas	2	2	6	7	29	35	41	49	66	80	14	17
6. Individuals responsible for completing certain sections of Evaluative Criteria	4	5	8	10	28	34	34	41	58	70	19	23
7. General discussion within departments or areas on all sections of the Criteria	1	1	14	17	18	22	43	52	61	74	16	19
8. Using outside consultants in self study	7	8	13	16	24	29	15	18	32	39	44	53
9. Modifying Criteria to needs of school	2	2	4	5	23	28	37	45	58	70	17	21
10. Involving board members in self study	2	2	14	17	21	25	30	36	52	63	24	29
11. Involving community members in self study	2	2	15	18	20	24	33	40	52	63	25	30
12. Summarizing & identifying strengths, weaknesses with recommendations for change	0	0	3	4	16	19	58	70	74	89	5	6

TABLE XVIII
(N=8)

The Effectiveness in Terms of Evaluation of Selected Activities of Self Study Committees in NCA Evaluations as reported by Administrators and Teachers in Schools below 200 enrollment.

Activities of Self Study Committees	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation								Use of Procedure			
	Least		Some		Moderate		Most		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Gathering and analyzing data	0	0	2	25	0	0	6	75	8	100	0	0
2. Sharing data in total faculty meetings	0	0	1	13	0	0	7	88	8	100	0	0
3. Sharing data through written reports to total faculty	0	0	1	13	5	63	2	25	7	88	1	13
4. Seeking feedback of total faculty in faculty meetings	0	0	1	13	2	25	5	63	8	100	0	0
5. Sharing data and seeking feedback within respective departments or subject areas	0	0	1	13	1	13	6	75	7	88	1	13
6. Individuals responsible for completing certain sections of Evaluative Criteria	0	0	1	13	1	13	6	75	8	100	0	0
7. General discussion within departments or areas on all sections of the Criteria	0	0	4	50	0	0	4	50	5	63	3	38
8. Using outside consultants in self study	1	13	1	13	5	63	1	13	3	38	5	63
9. Modifying Criteria to needs of school	0	0	1	13	2	25	5	63	8	100	0	0
10. Involving board members in self study	0	0	1	13	2	25	5	63	8	100	0	0
11. Involving community members in self study	0	0	3	38	0	0	5	63	7	88	1	13
12. Summarizing & identifying strengths, weaknesses with recommendations for change.	0	0	1	13	1	13	6	75	8	100	0	0

TABLE XIX
(N-23)

The Effectiveness in Terms of Evaluation of Selected Activities of Self Study Committees in NCA Evaluations as reported by Administrators and Teachers in Schools between 300 and 600 enrollment.

Activities of Self Study Committees	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation								Use of Procedure			
	Least		Some		Moderate		Most		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Gathering and analyzing data	0		2	9	8	35	11	49	20	87	2	9
2. Sharing data in total faculty meetings	0		3	14	6	26	8	35	15	65	7	30
3. Sharing data through written reports to total faculty	0		4	17	11	22	3	14	12	52	10	44
4. Seeking feedback of total faculty in faculty meetings	0		2	9	5	22	9	39	14	61	8	35
5. Sharing data and seeking feedback within respective departments or subject areas	0		2	9	13	57	6	26	17	74	5	22
6. Individuals responsible for completing certain sections of Evaluative Criteria	1	4	0		10	44	8	35	17	74	6	26
7. General discussion within departments or areas on all sections of the Criteria	1	4	1	4	9	39	11	48	19	83	4	17
8. Using outside consultants in self study	1	4	2	9	6	26	4	17	9	39	14	61
9. Modifying Criteria to needs of school	1	4	1	4	5	22	9	39	15	65	8	35
10. Involving board members in self study	0		4	17	3	14	7	30	10	44	13	57
11. Involving Community members in self study	0		5	22	3	14	7	30	10	44	13	57
12. Summarizing & identifying strengths, weaknesses with recommendations for change	0		0		7	30	15	65	21	91	1	4

TABLE XX
(N=21)

The Effectiveness in Terms of Evaluation of Selected Activities of Self Study Committees in NCA Evaluations as reported by Administrators and Teachers in Schools between 750 and 1000 enrollment

Activities of Self Study Committees	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation								Use of Procedure			
	Least		Some		Moderate		Most		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Gathering and analyzing data	0		0		8	38	12	57	19	91	2	10
2. Sharing data in total faculty meetings	1	5	5	24	6	29	6	29	8	38	12	57
3. Sharing data through written reports to total faculty	2	10	2	10	9	43	4	19	10	48	10	48
4. Seeking feedback of total faculty in faculty meetings	2	10	3	14	12	57	2	10	8	38	13	62
5. Sharing data and seeking feedback within respective departments or subject areas	2	10	2	10	1	5	16	76	18	86	3	14
6. Individuals responsible for completing certain sections of Evaluative Criteria	0		1	5	10	48	8	38	15	71	4	19
7. General discussion within departments or areas on all sections of the Criteria	0		0		1	5	17	81	17	81	1	5
8. Using outside consultants in self study	1	5	3	14	6	29	7	33	10	48	8	38
9. Modifying Criteria to needs of school	0		1	5	7	33	9	43	16	76	2	10
10. Involving board members in self study	0		0		12	57	7	33	14	67	4	19
11. Involving community members in self study	0		2	10	8	38	8	38	15	71	3	14
12. Summarizing & identifying strengths, weaknesses with recommendations for change	0		0		2	10	16	76	17	81	2	10

TABLE XXI
(N=18)

The Effectiveness in Terms of Evaluation of Selected Activities of Self Study Committees in NCA Evaluations as reported by Administrators and teachers in Schools between 1500 and 2000 enrollment

Activities of Self Study Committees	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation								Use of Procedure			
	Least		Some		Moderate		Most		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Gathering and analyzing data	0		0		5	28	11	61	17	94	1	6
2. Sharing data in total faculty meetings	1	6	2	11	5	28	4	22	11	61	7	39
3. Sharing data through written reports to total faculty	1	6	2	11	5	28	7	39	11	61	7	39
4. Seeking feedback of total faculty in faculty meetings	0		3	17	7	39	2	11	11	61	7	39
5. Sharing data and seeking feedback within respective departments or subject areas	0		0		10	57	7	39	16	89	2	11
6. Individuals responsible for completing certain sections of Evaluative Criteria	2	11	4	22	2	11	8	44	11	61	5	28
7. General discussion within departments or areas on all sections of the Criteria	0		4	22	8	44	4	22	13	72	4	22
8. Using outside consultants in self study	2	11	4	22	4	22	1	6	6	33	10	56
9. Modifying Criteria to needs of school	1	6	0		6	33	7	39	12	67	3	17
10. Involving board members in self study	1	6	4	22	3	17	6	33	13	72	4	22
11. Involving community members is self study	1	6	2	11	7	39	6	33	11	61	6	33
12. Summarizing & identifying strengths, weaknesses with recommendations for change.	0		1	6	5	28	11	61	16	89	1	6

TABLE XXII
(N=13)

The Effectiveness in Terms of Evaluation of Selected Activities of Self Study Committees in NCA Evaluations as reported by Administrators and Teachers in Schools over 2000 enrollment.

Activities of Self Study Committee	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation								Use of Procedure			
	Least		Some		Moderate		Most		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Gathering and analyzing data	0	0	0	0	2	15	10	77	11	85	1	8
2. Sharing data in total faculty meetings	0	0	1	8	3	23	7	54	8	62	4	31
3. Sharing data through written reports to total faculty	0	0	1	8	3	23	7	54	9	69	3	23
4. Seeking feedback of total faculty in faculty meetings	0	0	2	15	3	23	6	46	8	62	4	31
5. Sharing data and seeking feedback within respective departments or subject areas	0	0	1	8	4	31	6	46	8	62	3	23
6. Individuals responsible for completing certain sections of Evaluative Criteria	1	8	2	15	5	39	4	31	7	54	4	31
7. General discussion within departments or areas on all sections of the Criteria	0	0	5	31	0	0	7	54	7	54	4	31
8. Using outside consultants in self study	2	15	3	23	3	23	2	15	4	31	7	54
9. Modifying Criteria to needs of school	0	0	1	8	3	23	7	54	7	54	4	31
10. Involving board members in self study	1	8	5	31	1	8	4	31	5	39	5	39
11. Involving community members in self study	1	8	3	23	2	15	7	54	9	69	2	15
12. Summarizing & identifying strengths, weaknesses with recommendations for change.	0	0	1	8	1	8	10	77	12	92	1	8

TABLE XXIII
(N=21)

The Effectiveness in Terms of Evaluation of Selected Activities of Self Study Committees in NCA Evaluations as reported by Administrators

Activities of Self Study Committees	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation								Use of Procedure			
	Least		Some		Moderate		Most		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Gathering and analyzing data	0		3	14	5	24	13	62	21	100	0	
2. Sharing data in total faculty meetings	0		2	10	7	33	9	43	16	76	4	19
3. Sharing data through written reports to total faculty	1	5	1	5	10	48	6	29	13	62	7	33
4. Seeking feedback of total faculty in faculty meetings	0		3	14	10	48	5	24	16	76	5	24
5. Sharing data and seeking feedback within respective departments or subject areas	0		3	14	10	48	7	33	18	86	3	14
6. Individuals responsible for completing certain sections of Evaluative Criteria	2	10	5	24	5	24	7	33	15	71	4	19
7. General discussion within departments or areas on all sections of the Criteria	0		4	19	5	24	9	43	15	71	3	14
8. Using outside consultants in self study	2	10	4	19	6	29	2	10	6	29	11	52
9. Modifying Criteria to needs of school	1	5	3	14	5	24	6	29	11	52	6	29
10. Involving board members in self study	0		5	24	7	33	6	29	14	67	4	19
11. Involving community members in self study	1	5	4	19	6	29	7	33	12	57	5	24
12. Summarizing & identifying strengths weaknesses with recommendations for change.	0		1	5	5	24	12	57	18	86	0	

TABLE XXIV

(N=62)

The Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation of Selected Activities of Self Study Committees in NCA Evaluations as reported by Teachers.

Activities of Self Study Committees	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation								Use of Procedure			
	Least		Some		Moderate		Most		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Gathering and analyzing data	0	0	1	2	18	29	37	60	54	87	6	10
2. Sharing data in total faculty meetings	2	3	10	16	13	21	23	37	34	55	26	42
3. Sharing data through written reports to total faculty	2	3	9	15	23	37	17	27	36	58	24	39
4. Seeking feedback of total faculty in faculty meetings	2	3	8	13	19	31	19	31	33	53	27	44
5. Sharing data and seeking feedback within respective departments or subject areas	2	3	3	5	19	31	34	55	48	77	11	18
6. Individuals responsible for completing certain sections of Evaluative Criteria	2	3	3	5	23	37	27	44	43	69	15	24
7. General discussion within departments or areas on all sections of the Criteria	1	2	10	16	13	21	34	55	46	74	13	21
8. Using outisde consultants in self study	5	8	9	15	18	29	13	21	26	42	33	53
9. Modifying Criteria to needs of school	1	2	1	2	18	29	31	50	47	76	11	18
10. Involving board members in self study	2	3	9	15	14	23	24	39	38	61	20	32
11. Involving community members in self study	1	2	11	18	14	23	26	42	40	65	20	32
12. Summarizing & identifying strengths, weaknesses with recommendations for change	0	0	2	3	11	18	46	74	56	90	5	8

PART II

The Visitation

The Evaluation Guide for Secondary Schools[2] says the "the accent of the visitation is upon school improvement rather than accreditation status" and that, therefore, "the visiting committee members come to the school as consultants, not as critics." It is in this spirit, then, that the visitation should proceed upon the completion of the self study. Contingent upon this, however, is the selection, composition, and activities of the visiting committee. It is through the processes of selection and composition that much can be done to enhance the consultative rather than the critic role of the visiting committee so that the school may have the benefit of new ideas. And it is through the activities of the visiting committee that this attitude is consummated.

Selection and Composition of the Visiting Committee

The composition of the visiting committee in an NCA evaluation reflects to some degree the particular needs of the school. Yet, there are certain basic selection procedures which are related to the total effectiveness of the evaluation. This is evident in the responses that the administrators and teachers have made to the survey queries in this area. For instance, on table XXV it is quite clear that they not only used but preferred specialists in the area to be evaluated. It is also clear that they did not generally use or want visiting committee members from only secondary schools or only colleges. They prefer representation from both on the committee with a definite bias towards secondary schools of comparable size.

[2] op. cit, p. 12.

TABLE XXV
(N=83)

The Effectiveness in Terms of Evaluation of the Selection and Composition of the Visiting Committee in NCA Evaluations as reported by Administrators and Teachers

Visiting Committee Selection & Composition	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation								Use of Procedure			
	Least		Some		Moderate		Most		Yes		No	
Selection	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. By steering committee	5	6	7	8	26	31	31	37	49	59	25	30
2. By administration	7	8	4	5	29	35	18	22	43	52	31	37
3. By both of the above	2	2	1	1	21	25	40	48	45	54	30	36
4. By both with NCA and visiting chairperson approval	5	6	7	8	18	22	33	40	46	55	29	35
5. By NCA and visiting chairperson only	26	31	8	10	6	7	2	2	5	6	65	78
Composition												
6. Specialists in area of evaluation	0	0	4	5	16	19	58	70	77	93	3	4
7. Generalists	6	7	8	10	32	39	21	25	57	69	16	19
8. From secondary schools only	8	10	9	11	18	22	12	15	17	21	55	66
9. From colleges only	22	27	10	12	9	11	2	2	5	6	65	78
10. From both of the above	1	1	4	5	16	19	50	60	69	83	9	11
11. From comparable size schools	0	0	7	8	17	21	47	57	69	83	6	7
12. From larger schools	4	5	17	21	32	39	11	13	55	66	16	19

TABLE XXVI
(N=8)

The Effectiveness in Terms of Evaluation of the Selection and Composition of the Visiting Committee in NCA Evaluations as reported by Administrators and Teachers in Schools below 200 enrollment.

Visiting Committee Selection & Composition	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation				Use of Procedure	
	Least	Some	Moderate	Most	Yes	No
	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %
Selection						
1. By steering committee	0 0	1 13	5 63	2 25	7 88	1 13
2. By adminstration	0 0	0 0	5 63	3 38	7 88	1 13
3. By both of the above	0 0	0 0	2 25	6 75	8 100	0 0
4. By both with NCA and visiting chairperson approval	0 0	1 13	2 25	5 63	7 88	1 13
5. By NCA and visiting chairperson only	5 63	0 0	1 13	0 0	0 0	8 100
Composition						
6. Specialists in area of evaluation	0 0	0 0	3 38	4 50	7 88	0 0
7. Generalists	0 0	2 25	2 25	3 38	7 88	0 0
8. From secondary schools only	2 25	2 25	0 0	1 13	1 13	5 63
9. From colleges only	3 38	2 25	0 0	0 0	0 0	6 75
10. From both of the above	1 13	0 0	0 0	6 75	6 75	1 13
11. From comparable size schools	0 0	2 25	0 0	5 63	7 88	0 0
12. From larger schools	0 0	3 38	1 13	3 38	7 88	0 0

TABLE XXVII
(N=23)

The Effectiveness in Terms of Evaluation of the Selection and Composition of the Visiting Committee in NCA Evaluation as reported by Administrators and Teachers is Schools between 300 and 600 enrollment

Visiting Committee Selection & Composition	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation				Use of Procedure	
	Least N %	Some N %	Moderate N %	Most N %	Yes N %	No N %
Selection						
1. By steering committees	0	2 9	5 22	9 39	13 51	8 35
2. By administration	1 4	0	4 17	2 9	7 30	14 61
3. By both of the above	0	0	3 14	10 44	9 39	12 52
4. By both with NCA and visiting chairperson	1 4	1 4	4 17	7 30	10 44	12 52
5. By NCA and visiting chairperson only	4 17	0	0	0	0	21 91
Composition						
1. Specialists in area of evaluation	0	0	6 26	14 61	21 91	2 9
2. Generalists	0	0	10 44	6 26	18 78	2 9
3. From secondary schools only	2 9	0	3 14	3 14	3 14	17 74
4. From colleges only	5 22	0	1 4	1 4	0	19 82
5. From both of the above	0	0	4 17	13 57	21 91	1 4
6. From comparable size schools	0	0	5 22	13 57	19 83	3 14
7. From larger schools	1 4	1 4	9 39	4 17	17 74	4 17

TABLE XXVIII
(N=21)

The Effectiveness in Terms of Evaluation of the Selection and Composition of the Visiting Committee in NCA Evaluation as reported by Administrators and Teachers in Schools between 750 and 1000 enrollment

Visiting Committee Selection & Composition	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation								Use of Procedure			
	Least		Some		Moderate		Most		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Selection												
1. By steering committee	3	14	4	19	6	29	6	29	8	38	11	52
2. By administration	1	5	1	5	8	38	7	33	15	71	5	24
3. By both of the above	1	5	1	5	9	43	6	29	11	52	8	32
4. By both with NCA and visiting chairperson approval	1	5	2	10	7	33	6	29	10	48	7	33
5. By NCA and visiting chairperson only	5	24	4	19	4	19	0		1	5	15	71
Composition												
6. Sepecialists in area of evaluation	0		1	5	1	5	19	91	20	95	0	
7. Generalists	4	19	0		7	33	5	24	12	57	6	29
8. From secondary schools only	2	10	2	10	7	33	4	19	5	24	13	62
9. From colleges only	8	38	3	14	3	14	0		0		17	81
10. From both of the above	0		3	14	4	19	12	57	17	81	3	14
11. From comparable size schools	0		2	10	3	14	14	67	17	81	2	10
12. From larger schools	2	10	4,	19	10	48	3	14	15	71	4	19

TABLE XXIX
(N=18)

The Effectiveness in Terms of Evaluation of the Selection and Composition of the Visiting Committee in NCA Evaluations as reported by Administrators and teachers in Schools between 1500 and 2000 enrollment

Visiting Committee Selection & Composition	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation								Use of Procedure			
	Least		Some		Moderate		Most		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Selection												
1. By steering committee	2	11	0		4	22	8	44	13	72	2	11
2. By administration	2	11	1	6	9	50	2	11	10	56	4	22
3. By both of the above	1	6	0		3	17	12	67	13	72	4	22
4. By both with NCA and visiting chairperson approval	3	17	1	6	3	17	8	44	12	67	6	33
5. By NCA and visiting chairperson only	6	33	1	6	1	6	1	6	4	22	12	67
Composition												
6. Specialists in area of evaluation	0		2	11	5	28	11	61	17	94	1	6
7. Generalists	2	11	5	28	7	39	2	11	13	72	5	28
8. From secondary schools only	1	6	2	11	7	39	0		4	22	13	72
9. From colleges only	1	6	4	22	3	17	0		3	17	14	78
10. From both of the above	0		0		6	33	10	56	16	89	1	6
11. From comparable size schools	0		2	11	7	39	8	44	15	83	1	6
12. From larger schools	0		6	33	7	39	1	6	12	67	3	17

TABLE XXX
(N=13)

The Effectiveness in Terms of Evaluation of the Selection and Composition of the Visiting Committee in NCA Evaluations as reported by Administrators and Teachers in Schools over 2000 enrollment.

Visiting Committee Selection & Composition	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation								Use of Procedure			
	Least		Some		Moderate		Most		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Selection												
1. By steering committee	0	0	0	0	6	46	6	46	8	62	3	23
2. By administration	3	23	2	15	3	23	4	31	4	31	7	54
3. By both of the above	0	0	0	0	4	31	6	46	4	31	6	46
4. By both with NCA and visiting chairperson approval	0	0	2	15	2	15	7	54	7	54	3	23
5. By NCA and visiting chairperson only	6	46	3	23	0	0	1	8	0	0	9	69
Composition												
6. Specialists in area of evaluation	0	0	1	8	1	8	10	54	12	92	0	0
7. Generalists	0	0	1	8	6	46	5	39	7	54	3	23
8. From secondary schools only	1	8	3	23	1	8	4	31	4	31	7	54
9. From colleges only	5	39	1	8	2	15	1	8	2	15	9	69
10. From both of the above	0	0	1	8	2	15	9	69	9	69	3	23
11. From comparable size schools	0	0	1	8	2	15	7	54	11	85	0	0
12. From larger schools	1	8	3	23	5	39	0	0	4	31	5	39

TABLE XXXI
(N=21)

The Effectiveness in Terms of Evaluation of the Selection and Composition of the Visiting Committee in NCA Evaluations as reported by Administrators

Visiting Committee Selection & Composition	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation								Use of Procedure			
	Least		Some		Moderate		Most		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Selection												
1. By steering committee	1	5	3	14	5	24	10	48	14	67	6	29
2. By administration	1	5	0		10	48	5	24	14	67	5	24
3. By both of the above	1	5	0		5	24	11	52	13	62	6	29
4. By both with NCA and visiting chairperson approval	3	14	3	14	3	14	10	48	14	67	7	33
5. By NCA and visiting chairperson only	8	38	2	10	1	5	0		2	10	16	76
Composition												
6. Specialists in area of evaluation	0		3	14	6	29	11	52	20	95	0	
7. Generalists	1	5	5	24	7	33	5	24	17	81	2	10
8. From secondary schools only	3	14	3	14	3	14	2	10	5	24	11	52
9. From colleges only	5	24	2	10	3	14	0		2	10	14	67
10. From both of the above	1	5	0		6	29	12	57	18	86	2	10
11. From comparable size schools	0		3	14	8	38	8	38	18	86	0	
12. From larger schools	0		10	48	5	24	1	5	15	71	3	14

TABLE XXXII
(N=62)

The Effectiveness in Terms of Evaluation of the Selection and Composition of the Visiting Committee in NCA Evaluations as Reported by Teachers.

Visiting Committee Selection and Composition	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation								Use of Procedure			
	Least		Some		Moderate		Most		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Selection												
1. By steering committee	4	7	4	7	21	34	21	34	35	57	19	31
2. By administration	6	10	4	7	19	31	13	21	29	47	26	42
3. By both of the above	1	2	1	2	16	26	29	47	32	52	24	39
4. By both with NCA and visiting chairperson approval	2	3	4	7	15	24	23	37	32	52	22	36
5. By NCA and visiting chairperson only	18	29	6	10	5	8	2	3	3	5	49	79
Composition												
6. Specialists in area of evaluatson	0	0	1	2	10	16	47	76	57	92	3	5
7. Generalists	5	8	3	5	25	40	16	26	40	65	14	23
8. From secondary schools only	5	8	6	10	15	24	10	16	12	19	44	71
9. From colleges only	17	27	8	13	6	10	2	3	3	5	51	82
10. From both of the above	0	0	4	7	10	16	38	61	51	82	7	11
11. From comparable size schools	0	0	4	7	9	15	39	63	51	82	6	10
12. From larger schools	4	7	7	11	27	44	10	16	40	65	13	21

The desireability of sharing in the selection process itself is also evident since they expressed a clear mandate for not leaving this responsibility solely to the NCA and the visiting chairman.

Tables XXVI, XXVII, XXVIII, XXIX, and XXX indicate no great difference in opinion and use by size of school; nor is there any general disagreement between administrators and teachers on tables XXXI and XXXII.

Activities of Visiting Committee

A visiting committee engages in a variety of activities as it gathers and analyzes data for the purpose of evaluation. However, there are several basic modes of behavior which are more effective than others in performing this task. Therefore, one of the purposes of this survey was to identify those activities which were regarded as effective and to determine the extent of their use.

Table XXXIII indicates high frequency of use of the following procedures on the part of the visiting committee: an initial informal get-acquainted meeting, orientation by visiting committee, classroom visits by evaluators, discussions with students by evaluators, checking criteria forms filled out by faculty, final oral report to administration and board, final written report to administration and board, final written report to faculty, soliciting community opinion on the educational program, and continued contact with the faculty. Of these, classroom visits by evaluators was used most frequently and was judged as most effective in terms of evaluation. A final written report to the administration and board was next, followed by an orientation by the visiting committee, an initial informal get-acquainted meeting, checking criteria forms, continued contact with faculty, final written report to faculty, and final oral report to the administration and board. Of those most frequently used, the activity

of soliciting community opinion on educational programs was identified as least effective in terms of evaluation as was a final oral report to the faculty which was an infrequently used activity. While these latter two activities had the most spread in response on balance they were regarded as effective procedures by the respondents since a majority in each case saw them as moderate or most effective in terms of evaluation.

Tables XXIV, XXV, XXVI, XXXVII, and XXXVIII indicate that size of school was not a significant factor in the evaluation of the effectiveness and use of the activities of the visiting committee. A comparison of administrator and teacher responses on tables XXXIX and XL reveals, however, that teachers tended to perceive a final oral report to the faculty as more effective than did administrators. There was general agreement on the other activities, however.

TABLE XXXIII
(N=83)

The Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation of Selected Activities of the Visiting Committee in NCA Evaluations as reported by Administrators and Teachers.

Activities of Visiting Committees	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation								Use of Procedure			
	Least		Some		Moderate		Most		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Initial informal get-acquainted meeting	0	0	6	7	21	25	52	62	78	94	2	2
2. Orientation by visiting committee	0	0	3	4	18	22	53	64	72	87	5	6
3. Classroom visits by evaluators	1	1	1	1	16	19	61	74	76	92	3	4
4. Discussions with students by evaluators	2	2	3	4	26	31	44	53	76	92	2	2
5. Continued contact with faculty	1	1	6	7	16	19	47	57	62	75	15	18
6. Checking Criteria forms filled out by faculty	0	0	4	5	27	33	47	57	79	95	1	1
7. Soliciting community opinion on educational program	0	0	10	12	32	39	27	33	66	80	13	16
8. Final oral report to faculty	5	6	9	11	19	23	24	28	27	33	50	60
9. Final oral report to administration and	0	0	2	2	28	34	43	52	71	86	5	6
10. Final written report to faculty	1	1	5	6	18	22	46	55	67	81	10	12
11. Final written report to administration and board	0	0	4	5	14	17	56	68	76	92	3	4

TABLE XXXIV
(N=8)

The Effectiveness in Terms of Evaluation of Selected Activities of the Visiting Committee in NCA Evaluations as reported by Administrators and Teachers in Schools below 200 enrollment.

Activities of Visiting Committees	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation								Use of Procedure			
	Least		Some		Moderate		Most		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Initial informal get-acquainted meeting	0	0	0	0	3	38	4	50	7	88	0	0
2. Orientation by visiting committee	0	0	0	0	3	38	4	50	7	88	0	0
3. Classrooms visits by evaluators	0	0	0	0	1	13	6	75	7	88	0	0
4. Discussions with students by evaluators	0	0	0	0	3	38	4	50	7	88	0	0
5. Continued contact with faculty	0	0	1	13	1	13	4	50	5	63	2	25
6. Checking Criteria forms filled out by faculty	0	0	0	0	4	50	3	38	7	88	0	0
7. Soliciting community opinion on educational program	0	0	3	38	2	25	2	25	6	75	1	13
8. Final oral report to faculty	1	13	2	25	2	25	2	25	5	63	2	25
9. Final oral report to administration and board	0	0	1	13	2	25	4	50	7	88	0	0
10. Final written report to faculty	0	0	0	0	2	25	5	63	7	88	0	0
11. Final written report to administration and board	0	0	0	0	1	13	6	75	7	88	0	0

TABLE XXXV
(N=23)

The Effectiveness in Terms of Evaluation of Selected Activities of the Visiting Committee in NCA Evaluations as reported by Administrators and Teachers in Schools Between 300 and 600 enrollment

Activities of Visiting Committees	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation								Use of Procedure			
	Least		Some		Moderate		Most		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Initial informal get-aquainted meeting	0		0		4	17	17	74	21	91	1	4
2. Orientation by visiting committee	0		0		3	14	17	74	20	87	2	9
3. Classroom visits by evaluators	0		0		2	9	19	83	21	91	1	4
4. Discussions with students by evaluators	1	4	1	4	10	44	8	35	20	87	2	9
5. Continued contact with faculty	0		2	9	8	35	9	39	18	78	4	17
6. Checking Criteria forms filled out by faculty	0		1	4	5	22	15	65	21	91	1	4
7. Soliciting community opinion on educational program	0		2	9	10	44	7	30	18	78	4	17
8. Final oral report to faculty	0		0		5	22	5	22	5	22	17	74
9. Final oral report to administration and board	0		0		8	35	12	52	20	87	2	9
10. Final written report to faculty	0		0		4	17	15	65	19	83	2	9
11. Final written report to administration and board	0		0		4	17	16	70	20	87	1	4

TABLE XXXVI
(N=21)

The Effectiveness in Terms of Evaluation of Selected Activities of the Visiting Committee in NCA Evaluations as reported by Administrators and Teachers in Schools between 750 and 1000 enrollment

Activities of Visiting Committees	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation								Use of Procedure			
	Least		Some		Moderate		Most		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Initail informal get-acquainted meeting	0		3	14	3	14	15	71	20	95	0	
2. Orientation by visiting committee	0		1	5	6	29	13	62	19	91	1	5
3. Classroom visits by evaluators	1	5	0		8	38	12	57	17	81	2	10
4. Discussions with students by evaluators	0		1	5	9	43	9	43	19	91	0	
5. Continued contact with faculty	1	5	3	14	5	24	11	52	16	76	4	19
6. Checking Criteria forms filled out by faculty	0		1	5	9	43	10	48	20	95	0	
7. Soliciting community opinion on educational program	0		2	10	9	43	6	29	15	71	4	19
8. Final oral report to faculty	1	5	3	14	9	43	4	19	7	33	12	57
9. Final oral report to administration and board	0		0		12	57	8	38	18	86	3	14
10. Final written report to faculty	1	5	0		4	19	13	62	17	81	3	14
11. Final written report to administration and board	0		0		4	19	15	71	20	95	0	

TABLE XXXVII
(N=18)

The Effectiveness in Terms of Evaluation of Selected Activities of the Visiting Committee in NCA Evaluations as reported by Administrators and teachers in Schools between 1500 and 2000 enrollment

Activities of Visiting Committees	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation								Use of Procedure			
	Least		Some		Moderate		Most		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Initial informal get-acquainted meeting	0		3	17	7	39	7	39	17	94	1	6
2. Orientation by visiting committee	0		0		1	6	13	72	15	83	0	
3. Classroom visits by evaluators	0		0		5	28	12	67	18	100	0	
4. Discussions with students by evaluators	0		0		3	17	14	78	18	100	0	
5. Continued contact with faculty	0		0		1	6	12	67	12	67	3	17
6. Checking Criteria forms filled out by faculty	0		2	11	5	28	10	56	18	100	0	
7. Soliciting community opinion on educational program	0		3	17	5	28	7	39	15	83	3	17
8. Final oral report to faculty	3	17	3	17	1	6	5	28	5	28	13	72
9. Final oral report to administration and board	0		1	6	4	22	10	56	16	89	0	
10. Final written report to faculty	0		5	28	4	22	8	44	16	89	1	6
11. Final written report to administration and board	0		4	22	2	11	11	61	18	100	0	

TABLE XXXVIII
(N=13)

The Effectiveness in Terms of Evaluation of Selected Activities of the Visiting Committee in NCA Evaluations as reported by Administrators and Teachers in Schools over 2000 enrollment.

Activities of Visiting Committees	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation								Use of Procedure			
	Least		Some		Moderate		Most		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Initial informal get-acquainted meeting	0	0	0	0	4	31	9	69	13	100	0	0
2. Orientation by visiting committee	0	0	2	15	5	39	6	46	11	85	2	15
3. Classroom visits by evaluators	0	0	1	8	0	0	12	92	13	100	0	0
4. Discussions with students by evaluators	1	8	1	8	1	8	9	69	12	92	0	0
5. Continued contact with faculty	0	0	0	0	1	8	11	85	11	85	2	15
6. Checking Criteria forms filled out by faculty	0	0	0	0	4	31	9	69	13	100	0	0
7. Soliciting community opinion on educational program	0	0	0	0	6	46	5	39	12	92	1	8
8. Final oral report to faculty	0	0	1	8	2	15	8	62	5	39	6	46
9. Final oral report to administration and board	0	0	0	0	2	15	9	69	10	77	1	8
10. Final written report to faculty	0	0	0	0	4	31	5	39	8	62	4	31
11. Final written report to administration and board	0	0	0	0	3	23	8	62	11	85	2	15

TABLE XXXIX
(N=21)

The Effectiveness in Terms of Evaluation of Selected Activities of the Visiting Committee in NCA Evaluations as reported by Administrators

Activities of Visiting Committees	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation								Use of Procedure			
	Least		Some		Moderate		Most		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Initial informal get-acquainted meeting	0		3	14	6	29	11	52	19	91	1	5
2. Orientation by visiting committee	0		1	5	4	19	15	71	20	95	0	
3. Classroom visits by evaluators	0		0		4	19	16	76	20	95	0	
4. Discussions with students by evaluators	0		1	5	8	38	11	52	20	95	0	
5. Continued contact with faculty	0		2	10	7	33	10	48	17	81	2	10
6. Checking Criteria forms filled out by faculty	0		3	14	9	43	8	38	20	95	0	
7. Soliciting community opinion on educational program	0		5	24	7	33	5	24	16	76	2	10
8. Final oral report to faculty	4	19	3	14	4	19	4	19	7	33	11	52
9. Final oral report to administration and board	0		1	5	5	24	14	67	20	95	0	
10. Final written report to faculty	0		4	19	5	24	8	38	15	71	3	14
11. Final written report to administration and board	0		3	14	1	5	16	76	20	95	0	

TABLE XL
(N=62)

The Effectiveness in Terms of Evaluation of Selected Activities of the Visiting Committee in NCA Evaluations as Reported by Teachers.

Activities of Visiting Committees	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation								Use of Procedure			
	Least		Some		Moderate		Most		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Initial informal get-acquainted meeting	0	0	3	5	15	24	41	66	59	95	1	2
2. Orientation by visiting committee	0	0	2	3	14	23	38	61	52	84	5	8
3. Classroom visits by evaluators	1	2	1	2	12	19	45	73	56	90	3	5
4. Discussions with students by evaluators	2	3	2	3	18	29	33	53	56	90	2	3
5. Continued contact with faculty	1	2	4	7	9	15	37	60	45	73	13	21
6. Checking Criteria forms filled out by faculty	0	0	1	2	18	29	39	63	59	95	1	2
7. Soliciting community opinion on educational program	0	0	5	8	25	40	22	36	50	81	11	18
8. Final oral report to administration and board	0	0	1	2	23	37	29	47	51	82	5	8
9. Final written report to faculty	1	2	1	2	13	21	38	61	52	84	7	11
10. Final written report to administration and board	0	0	1	2	13	21	40	65	56	90	3	5

PART III

Summary of Results

Within the purview of this survey and in terms of the variables which were investigated it would appear that the following procedures and activities would lend themselves to the most effective evaluation.

The Self Study

1. The steering committee should be selected by the administration and chaired by a person similarly selected. It should be composed of experienced faculty with representation insofar as possible from each department or subject area.
2. The work committees should be selected by the steering committee and they should be constituted to reflect interdepartmental or interdisciplinary membership. There should be total faculty participation on at least one committee and, where possible, committees should be larger than three.
3. The activities of the self study committees should be concentrated on gathering and analyzing data so that they can identify strengths and weaknesses and make recommendations for change. To accomplish these tasks the committees should make individuals responsible for completing certain sections of the Evaluative Criteria, modifying it to meet the needs of the school, and sharing this data within their respective departments or subject areas. Feedback should be sought through general discussion on all sections of the Criteria. Size of school is a factor in determining to what extent data should be shared and discussed by the total faculty.

The Visitation

1. The visiting committee should be chosen by the steering committee and administration with the approval of the visiting chairperson and the NCA.
2. The composition of the visiting committee should emphasize expertise (i.e. specialists) in the area in which they are evaluating. The members should be chosen from both the college and secondary school ranks with emphasis on comparable size schools in the latter case.
3. The visiting committee should conduct an informal get-acquainted meeting and an orientation for the faculty before actually beginning their evaluation.
4. The visiting committee should use the Evaluative Criteria forms filled out by the faculty in their evaluation and they should make classroom visits and maintain contact with the faculty throughout the visitation. They should also engage in discussions with students.
5. Before they leave the visiting committee should make a final oral report to the administration and the board. The final written report should be sent to the administration and the board and be made available to the faculty.

Another aspect of this study was to visit the administrators of schools which had undergone a recent evaluation to secure additional information concerning the effectiveness of the procedures and activities in NCA evaluations. This was accomplished by talking with twelve administrators in nine schools of various sizes within NCA Districts 6 and 7. Most of these administrators had, of course, previously returned a questionnaire and their responses are a part of the complete report. There were many

excellent suggestions since many had either served as a chairman of a visiting committee on an NCA evaluation or as a visiting committee member. Their general comments are related as follows:

Generally they gave high marks to the evaluative process engaged in under the auspices of the NCA. Its scope and depth seemed to them to be the best conceptualized and best organized of any now presently in use.

Their suggestions for improvement, therefore, were related primarily to improving the model in its existing form so as to make it more effective for improving the educational programs of the schools. More specifically they felt the need for improving coordination with other evaluative agencies particularly when several were in the school at same time. The question of the responsibility of evaluation in the overlapping areas of vocational education was cited as paramount by several.

Another suggestion which secured favorable consensus as a possible improvement was the identification through the administrators of NCA schools of superior teachers in each area of evaluative concern to comprise a master list from which schools undergoing evaluation could select their visiting committees. This was regarded as an effective way for spreading quality instructional ideas among NCA schools.

A very creditable idea related to the use of recommendations made by the self study and visiting committees in the follow up phase of evaluation was also suggested. It called for the establishment of a priority committee consisting of administration, faculty and students whose task it would be to take the various recommendations, rank them according to need and feasibility, and submit them to the superintendent

and the board for their support. This was believed to be a method by which action could be enhanced and, thus, make the evaluation more useful.

A Final Comment

It would be presumptuous to conclude that on the basis of the procedures and activities identified in this survey that a particular school would enjoy an effective evaluation - one that portends maximum quality in the direction it gives to that school. Indeed, the above should be regarded as minimal activity on the part of the self study and visiting committees if an effective evaluation is to occur. Much more, of course, is involved. In addition, the roles of the visiting chairperson and the principal are vital, and certainly most crucial is the general attitude that the school has towards the purpose of evaluation. The climate of the school must be one in which strengths are regarded as opportunities and weaknesses as challenges if the school is to get the most out of its evaluative efforts. It is clear, however, that if the desire is there the system is flexible enough to make it happen.

Finally, this investigator wishes to express his gratitude to the administrators and the faculties of the schools who participated in this study. The time and effort that each spent on filling out the survey form answering my questions is indicative of their desire to engage in dialogue on the improvement of education.

SURVEY OF SELF STUDY AND VISITING COMMITTEE PROCEDURES IN NCA EVALUATIONS

Name_____
Position_____
School_____

Self Study Procedures

Selection & Composition of Self Study Committees (please answer each item)	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation (check each item)				Was Procedure used in your evaluation?	
Steering Committee	Least	some	moderate	most	Yes	No
1. Selected by faculty						
2. Selected from volunteers from faculty						
3. Selected by administration						
4. Selected from a pool of elected faculty by administration						
5. Departments heads only						
6. Representation from each department or subject area						
7. Less than one from each department or subject area						
8. Experienced faculty only						
9. Chairperson selected by faculty						
10. Chairperson selected by steering committee						
11. Chairperson selected by administrator						
12. Chairperson an administrator						
Other (list and check)						
1.						
2.						
Work Committees						
1. Selected by faculty in each department						
2. Volunteers						

Selection & Composition of Self Study Committees (please answer each item)	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation (check each item)				Was Procedure used in your evaluation?	
Work Committees (Cont.)	Least	some	moderate	most	Yes	No
3. Selected by steering committee						
4. Selected by administration						
5. Selected by department chairperson						
6. Experienced faculty only						
7. Interdepartmental or interdisciplinary membership						
8. Membership solely from department or subject area						
9. Total faculty participation on at least one committee						
10. Faculty participation on more than two committees						
11. Committee size equal to or less than three						
12. Committee size greater than three						
Other (list and check)						
1.						
2.						
Activities of Self Study Committees						
1. Gathering and analyzing data						
2. Sharing data in total faculty meetings						
3. Sharing data through written reports to total faculty						
4. Seeking feedback of total faculty in faculty meetings						
5. Sharing data and seeking feedback within respective departments or subject areas						
6. Individuals responsible for completing certain sections of Evaluative Criteria						

Selection & Composition of Self Study Committees (please answer each item)	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation (check each item)				Was Procedure used in your evaluation?	
Activities of Self Study Committees (Cont.)	Least	some	moderate	most	Yes	No
7. General discussion within departments or areas on all sections of the Criteria						
8. Using outside consultants in self study						
9. Modifying Criteria to needs of school						
10. Involving board members in self study						
11. Involving community members in self study						
12. Summarizing & identifying strengths, weaknesses with recommendations for change.						
Other (list and check)						
1.						
2.						

Visiting Committee Procedures

Selection & Composition of Visiting Committee (please answer each item)	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation (check each item)				Was Procedure used in your evaluation?	
Selection	Least	some	moderate	most	Yes	No
1. By steering committee						
2. By administration						
3. By both of the above						
4. By both with NCA and visiting chairperson approval						
5. By NCA and visiting chairperson only						
Other (list and check)						
1.						
2.						

Selection & Composition of Visiting Committee (please answer each item)	Effectiveness in terms of Evaluation (check each item)				Was Procedure used in your evaluation?	
Composition	Least	some	moderate	most	Yes	No
1. Specialists in area of evaluation						
2. Generalists						
3. From secondary schools only						
4. From colleges only						
5. From both of the above						
6. From comparable size schools						
7. From larger schools						
Other (list and check)						
1.						
2.						
Activities of Visiting Committees						
1. Initial informal get-acquainted meeting						
2. Orientation by visiting committee						
3. Classroom visits by evaluators						
4. Discussions with students by evaluators						
5. Continued contact with faculty						
6. Checking Criteria forms filled out by faculty						
7. Soliciting community opinion on educational program						
8. Final oral report to faculty						
9. Final oral report to administration and board						
10. Final written report to faculty						
11. Final written report to administration and board						
Other (list and check)						
1.						
2.						

THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONTRIBUTION! PLEASE RETURN IT TO YOUR PRINCIPAL.